

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

HANGZHOU AOSHUANG)	
E-COMMERCE CO., LTD.)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 19-cv-04565
v.)	
)	Judge Martha M. Pacold
008FASHION, ET. AL.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Status hearing and motion hearing held on 1/16/20. For the reasons stated in open court, Defendants' Motion to Vacate or Modify the Preliminary Injunction Orders to Lift Asset Restraining Provisions [226] is granted in part, denied in part. The asset restraining provisions of the preliminary injunction orders [Docs. 29, 43, and 46] are vacated as to the following Defendants: Def. No. 124-qixing; Def. No. 146-Star star in the sky; Def. No. 168--william&jack; Def. No. 41--fashion-shop113; Def. No. 186--zagoo; Def. No. 40--fashion-shop112; Def. No. 11--aztuckers; Def. No. 185--yuzebaby; Def. No. 30--dongyang743; Def. No. 39--ZOGAA3 Store; Def. No. 56--Greatmen Store; Def. No. 28--zoggaofficial store; Def. No. 82--ZOGAA SIX Store; Def. No. 25--ConvenientYourLife; Def. No. 180--yangxinyuan; Def. No. 55--Goodgoods8; Def. No. 173--Xiao wu big yards shop; Def. No. 44--fengzifei; Def. No. 45--fengzihyt-4; and Def. No. 134--Shirley Store. As to these defendants, it appears at this preliminary stage, based on the current state of the record, that the asset freeze is no longer warranted to preserve the remedy of an equitable accounting of profits. *See generally* *PhD Marketing, Inc. v. Cloud Commerce Systems Ltd.*, No. 1:15-cv-04702, Dkt. 49 (June 11, 2015); *Klipsch Group, Inc. v. Big Box Store Ltd.*, No. 12 Civ. 6283 (AJN), 2012 WL 5265727 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2012); *Klipsch Group, Inc. v. Big Box Store Ltd.*, No. 12 Civ. 6283 (AJN), 2012 WL 5265727 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 11, 2012). Plaintiff's counsel is directed to serve a copy of this order on the third-party platforms to notify them that the asset restraining provisions of the prior preliminary injunction orders have been lifted as to the defendants listed above.

In all other respects and for all other Defendants bringing the motion (i.e., Def. No. 15--babyzaima; Def. No. 33--Encantador KK Store; and Def. No. 182--Your Parcel Store), the motion [226] is denied. The asset restraining provisions of the preliminary injunction orders [Docs. 29, 43, and 46] remain in place, up to a total of

\$200,000, for the following Defendants: Def. No. 15--babyzaima; Def. No. 33--Encantador KK Store; and Def. No. 182--Your Parcel Store.

ENTERED:

Date: January 17, 2020

/s/ Martha M. Pacold